

REMARKS

Applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiner Culler for the courteous and helpful telephone interview that was conducted on April 1, 2010. Claims 1-34 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 21, 22, 28 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cattaruzza. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “[e]quipment for printing on non-woven-fabric, comprising a support driven such as to transport a sheet of non-woven-fabric, at least one driven printing body in order to carry out the printing and a control and command unit operatively connected with each of said support and at least one printing body such as to detect electrical signals originating from said support and at least one printing body, turn said signals into numerical values representative of the status of their angular speed and torque moment, compare said numerical values with ratios of preset numerical values of said angular speed and said torque moments and send signals to said support and at least one printing body in order to correct any possible variations in said values which fall out with said ratios.” [Emphasis added.]

The Examiner asserts, on page 11, that in Cattaruzza, “control of the torque in the process would inherently be carried out.” Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Examiner is misinterpreting the meaning of “control.” The Examiner states that “a change of rotational speed will inherently change the torque.” While this may be true, changing the torque is not the same as controlling the torque. In Cattaruzza, data related to the rotation rate is transmitted in order to synchronize electric motors 5, 6 and 7 (Col. 3, lines 46-49). There is no discussion in Cattaruzza of either monitoring or controlling the torque. While the rotation rates of the electric motors may change causing the torque to change, this does not control torque. Reading and controlling torque is different than reading and adjusting rotational speed to synchronize electric motors.

In contrast to Cattaruzza, the present claims recite that torque is controlled in the present invention by comparing signals for angular speed and torque with ratios of preset values for angular speed and torque. Then, signals are sent “in order to correct any possible variations in said values which fall out with said ratios.” Thus, unlike Cattaruzza, torque can be both changed and controlled to prevent the negative effects of tension on the non-woven fabric. Reading and controlling torque allows a more accurate control while reading rotational speed for synchronization purposes (as in the prior art) would not prevent a possible tensioning of the fabric that could occur during operation of the machine.

Since Cattaruzza does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Cattaruzza. If, as stated during the telephone interview, the Examiner believes that there are many prior art references that in fact disclose the control of torque in the manner recited in claim 1, applicant asserts that at least one of such references should be cited in a new, non-final Office Action so that applicant will have an opportunity to respond to the same.

Claims 2, 4 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 21, 22, 28 and 32-33 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, 15-16, 24-26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza in view of Takahashi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 15-16 and claims 24-26 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are patentable over Cattaruzza for at least the reasons mentioned above. Claim 34 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Takahashi, which has been cited as teaching a printer having a driven support provided with through holds which cooperate with holding means, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 10-14 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Deeming. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-14 and claim 27 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are patentable over the Cattaruzza and Takahashi combination for at least the reasons mentioned above. Deeming, which has been cited as teaching transporting fabric on a belt through which water can be separated by a vacuum, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza and Takahashi discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 17 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Kurihara. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 30 depend from independent claims 1 and 30, respectively, and are patentable over the Cattaruzza and Takahashi combination for at least the reasons mentioned above. Kurihara, which has been cited as teaching a widening function, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza and Takahashi discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 18-20, 23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza in view of Darel. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18-20 and claims 23 and 29 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are patentable over Cattaruzza for at least the reasons mentioned above. Darel, which has been cited as teaching a printer having an image acquiring device, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 31 depends from independent claim 21 and is patentable over Cattaruzza for at least the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In view of the above, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 6, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No. 31,063

Amy M. Kuo

Registration No. 62,374

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants